DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 914 SO 013 870

AUTHOR Adams, Charles; And Others
TITLE Ethnocentrism as a Multidimensional Paradigm: Prejudice and Homophily.
PUB DATE Dec 81
NOTE 33p.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Science Research; *Behavior Theories; *Ethnic Bias; Ethnic Discrimination; *Ethnocentrism; Literature Reviews; *Models; Stereotypes

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses a multi-dimensional model of ethnocentrism and describes a study that tests the prediction that this multi-dimensional model is a better predictor of communicative behaviors than a single dimensional model of ethnocentrism. First, four theories of ethnocentrism are reviewed in an attempt to find common links among approaches. The first theory discussed is belief congruence--perceptions of similar ingroup-outgroup beliefs, values, and culture. The second theory examined is racial congruence. Some researchers have found that race accounted for more variance in social distance than did belief similarity. Some experimental research on ethnocentrism has been explicitly grounded in the third theory discussed, balance theory, which relies on perceptions of differences to predict ethnocentric behavior. The fourth theory reviewed is the stereotyping/trait-attribution theory. Stereotyping of traits and attributes has been traditionally recognized as central to ethnocentric behavior. The four reviewed theories were found to have two common elements: (1) homophily-heterophily, defined as the degree to which pairs of individuals who interact are similar in certain attributes such as beliefs, values, and education, and social status; and (2) prejudice, an evaluative predisposition to respond to homophily judgments. The argument is thus made that ethnocentrism is a multi-dimensional construct. To test whether this multi-dimensional model of ethnocentrism is a better predictor of communicative behavior than a single dimensional model, 268 students from an introductory class in speech communication from a large university completed various tests. The results of the tests are reported and discussed in the paper. The model received considerable support. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215914

ETHNOCENTRISM AS A MULTIDIMENSIONAL PARADIGM:

PREJUDICE AND HOMOPHILY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✗ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

by

CHARLES ADAMS
Dia-E Systems, Inc.
Portland, Oregon

RAYMOND PREISS
Pacific Lutheran University
Tacoma, Washington

H. THOMAS HURT
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas

December 1981

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews four theories of ethnocentrism in an attempt to find common links among approaches. Common elements of the reviewed theories were (1) homophily-heterophily and (2) prejudice, an evaluative predisposition to respond to homophily judgments. The argument is thus made that ethnocentrism is a multi-dimensional construct.

Based on the review of literature and a multi-dimensional model, several hypotheses were formulated and tested. The model proposed was tested using three dependent variables: source credibility, interpersonal attraction and post message decoding comprehension. The results of the tests are reported and discussed. The model received considerable support.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Raymond Preiss
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 013 870

ETHNOCENTRISM = PREJUDICE + HOMOPHILY

Social Scientists have long demonstrated interest in relationships within and between groups. Since the turn of the century (Summer, 1906), a growing body of literature has focused upon a "syndrome of ethnocentrism," where symbols of one's own ethnic or national group or of the values shared by that group (or both) became objects of attachment, pride, and veneration; symbols of other groups or their values become objects of contempt and hatred (LeVine and Cambell, 1972, p. 1).

Research on the effects of ethnocentrism has given our field insight into a variety of communication behaviors. Aronson and Golden (1962), for instance, demonstrated that ethnocentrism has substantial impact on the effectiveness of communication. Delia (1972) indicated that the stereotypes held by subjects have impact on communication variables. Also, it has been shown, communication can mediate the effects of prejudice (Taylor & Gardner, 1969).

Recently, Jerry Burk (1975) advocated using ethnocentrism as a concept that binds together a number of disciplines with common interest in intercultural communication. He indicated that ethnocentrism "may provide a rubric within which existing sub-groups (different disciplines) can make a contribution which will bring us closer to a more systematic approach and ultimately theories of intercultural communication (Burk, 1975, p. 18).

Theories of Ethnocentrism:

Although a number of theories have been advanced that attempt to explain ethnocentrism, only four representative theories were considered in this paper. The theoretical perspectives discussed are: belief congruence, racial congruence,

balance models and stereotyping-trait attribution. Each approach has had a significant impact on the study of ethnocentrism by communication scholars.

Belief Congruence Rokeach (1960) placed primary importance on perceptions of similar ingroup-outgroup beliefs, values and culture in his theory of intergroup relations. In studies involving religious groups, he found that church membership trends, choice of denominations, and interfaith marriages were related to belief similarity. Rokeach and Mezei (1966) extended this analysis to race relations and concluded that belief dissimilarity (as opposed to skin color) was the explanation for ethnocentrism. Support for this notion was offered by Wilson (1972). He surveyed 12 ethnic areas of Kenya for attitudes toward the other areas. Ingroup-outgroup determinations were observed to follow perceptions of linguistic and common-origin similarities, with cultural similarities meaningfully improving the model. This evidence implicitly included similarities in cultural norms, beliefs and attitudes as a predictor of ethnocentrism.

Rabbie and Horowitz (1969) offered further insight into the belief congruence model. Subjects in their experiment were classified into two groups. A reward for participation in the study was randomly given to one group. The results indicated that the reward alone generated significant bias in favor of the rewarded group (the ingroup). The authors concluded that subjects ". . . were reacting to perceived emotional changes in themselves and others" (p. 277), which led to difficulties in interpersonal encounters with the other group and ultimately to intergroup prejudice. While many implications can be drawn from this research, it is clear that intergroup relations were altered by perceptions of dissimilar emotional states. This research indicated support for the belief congruence theory in that interpersonal encounters were seen as dependent upon emotional changes (or states) in both groups. In other words, dissimilarity generated intergroup hostility and prejudice.

In sum, the belief congruence approach to ethnocentrism views social discrimination as operating as the result of perceived differences in belief and value systems (Rokeach, Smith & Evans, 1960). Rokeach and Rothman (1965) concurred when they concluded:

> . . .we tend to value people in proportion to the degree to which they exhibit beliefs, subsystems, or systems of beliefs congruent with our own (p. 128).

Racial Congruence A second major impetus for research evolved in direct opposition to the belief congruence orientation. Triandis (1961) argued that the belief model was primarily applicable to friendship choices, rather than prejudice. Using multiple target inductions and the Bogardus Social Distance Measure (Bogardus, 1958), Triandis (1961) found that race accounted for more variance in social distance than did belief similarity. However, philosophy, occupation and religion were found to significantly improve the statistical model.

Clark and Clark (1947) used white and brown dolls as stimulus objects in a study of the development of racial identification. Black children indicated a clear knowledge of racial differences and racial identification was strongly related to the subjects' skin color. This would indicate that outgroups as well as ingroups, recognize racial differences. These results suggested that Black children preferred white dolls. Thus it is likely that race when considered apart from belief congruence is a significant factor in ethnocentrism.

The notion of reciprocally recognized racial differences underscores racial congruence as a viable perspective for research on ethnocentrism. Investigations have attempted to extend this analysis to high and low prejudiced subjects. Studies by Bryne and McGraw (1964) and Bryne and Wong (1962) found that low prejudiced subjects reacted no differently to white or black targets even when

information about race and attitudes was provided. Highly prejudiced subjects, however, were found to react to both race and attitudinal information. This may indicate that racial congruence applies to prejudiced subjects only. Byrne and Wong (1962) found that ethnicity affected attitudinal similarity. Furthermore, ethnicity affected interpersonal attraction, but did not interact with attitudinal similarity to affect interpersonal attraction.

A further extension of this analysis was offered by Triandis and Davis (1965). The authors employed multiple criterion variables in their examination of race- and belief-congruence theories. Data indicated that subjects assigned different value to the racial and belief information provided depending on which criterion variable was measured. This suggests that both theories are probably of value when making predictions about the effects of ethnocentrism on interpersonal behavior.

Balance Models Some experimental research on ethnocentrism has been explicitly grounded in balance theory as constructed by Heider (1958). Byrne and Wong (1962) argued that ethnocentric subjects who responded negatively to outgroup targets and positively to an attitudinal 'X' object, would be predisposed to assume that the outgroup target will react negatively toward the same 'X'. This would subsume racial congruence under the larger construct, a balance model.

Importantly, the balance model also addresses belief congruity. To the extent that beliefs are perceived as similar, the balance model would generate predictions similar to belief congruity theory (Levine and Campbell, 1972). Unfortunately, this approach to ethnocentrism suffers a critical liability in that it is topic bound. While the previous theories have made predictions across a variety of situations, balance models are effective only if attitudes toward the 'X' are known (c.f. Newcomb, 1961).

Stereotyping/Trait-Attribution Theories Stereotyping of traits and attributes has been traditionally recognized as central to ethnocentric behavior (Allport, 1954). Although scholars have tended to disagree as to the accuracy of stereotypes, current literature appears to suggest the 'kernel of truth' perspective is a viable approach for analyzing the nature of stereotypes (Levine and Cambell, 1972). This hypothesis indicated that basic realities are reflected in stereotyping categories, although the larger context of prejudice is fundamentally in error (Levine & Cambell. 1972, p. 169).

Stereotypes have been shown to have high internal consistency under most circumstances. The classic study by Katz and Braly (1933) asked subjects to match 84 descriptive terms to ten racial and national groups. Their data indicated that subjects held stable and elaborate stereotypes for a wide variety of ethnic groups. Furthermore, the nature of the stereotypes was not related to the amount of contact that the subjects had with the particular group stereotyped. An additional analysis of data indicated that these stereotypes were related to the preference shown for that group. When the desirability of the traits was compared to the prejudice expressed towards the group, it was found that the more desirable traits were assigned to groups that the subjects were less prejudiced towards. The authors concluded that racial prejudice was ". . .part of a general set of stereotypes" (Katz & Braly, 1933, p. 271).

This study also addressed the "kernel of truth" perspective of stereotype accuracy. The authors found that no relationship existed between the clearness-vagueness of the stereotype and the degree of prejudice expressed against the group. This suggests although marginal truth may be found in ascribed traits, the primary purpose of stereotypes is to justify the evaluation of persons from outgroups. The researchers concluded that prejudice was a pattern of rationalizations organized around a racial label (p. 271).

The notions of prejudice existing as one of a number of stereotypes was also supported by Anisfeld, Bogo and Lambert (1962). Subjects reacted to a Jewish target as less handsome and less leaderlike than a white American target. However, subjects did not respond affectively toward the target. Stereotypes were ascribed, but affective prejudice did not necessarily accompany the stereotype elicited. Similar results were obtained by Secord (1959) using black target inductions. This would indicate that there may be more than one component to ethnocentrism.

Brigham (1971) extended this analysis. He argued that behavioral intentions towards a target person from an outgroup were only indirectly linked to stereotyping. He indicated that ethnocentrism was likely to be bidimensional, comprised of a stereotyping dimension and an evaluation dimension. (Brigham, 1971).

The stereotypes held are subject to change in content. Katz and Braly (1935) maintained that individuals absorb stereotypes from their cultural environment. Research by Seago (1947) supported this analysis. Subjects were asked to rate Americans, Germans, Japanese and Blacks each year during the war. German and Japanese ratings decreased on a favorability index during the war, but increased after the war was concluded. Black stereotypes, however, remained consistently unfavorable. This tended to support the position that gradual changes in stereotypes are possible. After an extensive review of literature, Ehrlich (1973) concluded that ". . .changes in ethnic stereotype assignments follow changes in established ethnic groups relations" (p. 35).

This discussion must emphasize limitations of stereotyping as an explanation of ethnocentrism. Recent research has indicated that the strength of stereotypes is in question. Feldman (1972), for example, manipulated race of target, social mobility and occupation of target in his examination of stereotyping. Reasoning that mobility and occupation would disclose more information to subjects than would race, Feldman had subjects respond to a number of different targets. The results supported his hypothesis. Feldman and Hilterman (1975) replicated this study and

again found similar results. The consistency and power of stereotyping would be open to dispute. Feldman and Hilterman (1975) go so far as to suggest that stereotyping may be a weak component of the larger trait-attribution process.

Homophily-Heterophily as a Verifying Construct

Each of the perspectives reviewed in this paper are based on the underlying assumption that people go through some cognitive process by which they separate ingroup persons from outgroup persons. Each orientation makes somewhat unique predictions about how ethnocentrism is acquired and maintained. Yet, many similarities remain. These common themes may provide the basis for the more systematic approach to theory construction advocated by Burk (1975).

It is evident that belief congruence is concerned with differences and similarities between ingroups and outgroups Rokeach and Rothman (1965). Perceptions of differences based on racial characteristics is used as the underlying calculus in the writings on racial congruence (Triandis, 1961). Like the belief congruence model, balance models also rely on perceptions of differences to predict ethnocentric behavior (Byrne and Wong, 1962). Finally, stereotyping theories recognize that differences between ingroups and outgroups tend to predict the assignment of desirable and undesirable traits (Katz and Bradley, 1935).

Theory building in ethnocentrism may well turn to the field of diffusion of innovations where the similarity/difference concept has been extensively developed by Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) under the rubric of homophily-heterophily. In this context, perceived similarity/dissimilarity has been found to affect the flow of innovations across cultural boundaries.

Homophily-heterophily was defined as "The degree to which pairs of individuals interact are similar in certain attributes, such as beliefs, values, education, social status and the like (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971, p. 210)." It is evident from this definition that the four orientations can be unified using homophily as a subsuming construct. This adds a unique addition to the literature in that

perceived similarity may form the linchpin of a multidimensional theory of ethnocentrism.

The issue of multi-dimensionality has been largely ignored in the experimental literature. Most theorists have argued that ethnocentrism is merely an evaluative response to persons from outgroups (c.f., Allport, 1954; Sumner, 1906; Zadronzny, 1959). Zadronzny (1959) is the classic example of this type of thinking. He stated that ethnocentrism is the evaluation of persons from outgroups.

Yet there is evidence for the multidimensional view. Anisfeld, Bogo and Lambert (1962), for instance, indicated that stereotyping measures do not necessarily tap an evaluative response. These instruments may only be measuring a response about beliefs the subject hold about persons from the outgroup. Their study indicated that persons may respond to members of outgroups as having stereotypic traits but that response does not indicate that the subject has evaluated the targetperson as holding such traits. Brigham (1971) demonstrated that both stereotyping and an evaluation components are involved in determing the interpersonal attractiveness of targets from outgroups. These studies seem to suggest that future research may find it fruitful to consider the concept as multi-dimensional.

In sum, there may be at least two identifiable components to ethnocentrism: (1) homophily-heterophily and (2) an evaluative predisposition to respond to those perceptions. The perceptions of homophily-heterophily can be multi-dimensional and involve perceptions of similarities and differences based on race, religion, beliefs, attitudes and other assorted characteristics.

HYPOTHESES

Based on the model of ethnocentrism discussed above, three hypotheses were generated. This study has attempted to test the prediction that an additive multi-dimensional model of ethnocentrism is a better predictor of communicative behaviors and communicative related behaviors than a single dimensional model

of ethnocentrism.

H_1: Prejudice and homophily-heterophily when considered as a single psychological system, will account for more variance when predicting perceptions of source credibility than will either prejudice or homophily when considered alone.

H_2: Prejudice and homophily when considered as a single psychological system, will account for more variance when predicting perceptions of interpersonal attraction than will either prejudice of homophily when considered alone.

H_3: Prejudice and homophily when considered as a single psychological system, will account for more variance when predicting post message decoding comprehension, than will either prejudice or homophily when considered separately.

METHODS

Subjects

Two hundred and sixty-eight subjects were selected from an introductory class in Speech Communication from a large University. This project was given to students in their classrooms and participation was voluntary. Subjects were randomly assigned to one of the experimental conditions. One class (N=23) was assigned as a separate control group.

Operational Definitions

Ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism has been previously conceptualized as unidimensional (Zadronzy, 1959) and, therefore, it was assumed that a single factor should best describe this concept. A series of scales were selected from instruments used in previous research (Adnorno, et. al., 1950; Lambert & Klineberg, 1967; Phillips, 1951). Twenty items were isolated which appeared relevant to "prejudice towards outgroups." The 20 scales were submitted to an unrotated factor analysis and seven items were selected that loaded on the prejudice dimension. Internal reliability for the seven items was .71 as computed by the Nunnally 6-18 Procedure (Nunnally, 1967).

Homophily-heterophily. Two dimensions of homophily were measured by the McCroskey, Richmond and Daly (1975) measure of perceived homophily. The background and attitude dimensions have previously established validity and reliability. Reliability for each dimension in this study was greater than .65.

Source Credibility. Five dimensions of credibility for peers was measured by the McCroskey, Jensen and Valencia (1973) instrument. This instrument has been used successfully in past research. Internal reliability for all dimensions was greater than .65 with most r_{xx} congregating around .80.

Interpersonal Attraction. Although three dimensions of interpersonal attraction were used on the instrument, only two dimensions were used in data analyses. The McCroskey and McCain (1974) measure taps social, task and physical dimensions of attraction. The physical dimension of attraction was dropped because there was no intended manipulation in this area. This scale has been used in a variety of empirical study with consistent results across studies. The reliabilities for the two dimensions was in excess of .70.

Comprehension. A modified cloze procedure was used to measure comprehension (Taylor, 1954). This instrument was constructed by selectively omitting key words from the experimental message. A blank would appear where ever a word was deleted and the subjects were asked to supply in the word that was deleted. There were 54 deletions in a 320 word message. The number answered correctly served as a measure of comprehension.

This particular use of the cloze procedure has been found to be highly reliable (Wheeless, 1975). The construct validity of this type instrument was demonstrated by Chall (1958). Internal reliability for the instrument in this study was .85, a computed by a Spearman-Brown Split-Half Method (Ferguson, 1971).

Procedure

The instructor for each class received a set of booklets which were randomly

ordered. Each participant had an equal chance of being exposed to one of the ten sources used. Data for this study were collected during two consecutive class meetings. It was important to have the subjects believe that each part of the experiment was unrelated to the other parts of the experiment, so as to minimize possible demand characteristics which could have altered responses. The experiment was decoded into three stages.

Stage I. The experimental booklet contained a short introduction to the experiment, followed by a place for the subjects to indicate their social security numbers. A short paragraph which contained one of ten source inductions, each induction represented a different racial group. The particular names were selected from the Andersen and McNeill (1972) study, which indicated that the names were perceived as different in terms of competence and character. It was hypothesized that this effect was present due to reactions toward out-group targets. To further reinforce this perception, the paragraph contained information about the geographic origin of the target person.

The remainder of the experimental booklet consisted of scales used to measure perceptions of credibility, homophily and attraction. Upon completing the scales, the subjects read an informative message on the Central Intelligence Agency that was attributed to the target person. This topic was selected to minimize prior knowledge on the subject. The control group scores indicated a very low level of information about this topic.

Stage II. Part II was the comprehension instrument. The subjects completed the cloze test and responded to a series of manipulation checks. Subjects were asked to indicate what ethnic group their particular target person came from. In addition, they indicated what particular ethnic group they were a member of.

Stage III. Stage III was administered during the next class meeting. A one page instrument to measure prejudice was distributed at the beginning of the

class. After the booklets were collected the subjects were debriefed as to the purpose of the study and who to contact if further information was desired.

Results

Statistical Analyses Each hypothesis was tested by comparing the additive model of ethnocentrism with the single variable models. In the case of hypotheses one and two cannonical r's were obtained. In the case of hypothesis three, multiple r's were compared. The comparisons were computed using a one-tailed t-test of differences between correlated correlation coefficients (Ferguson, 1971).

Manipulation Check A correlation matrix was computed for all variables before the cannonical correlations were computed. This matrix indicated that the composure dimension of credibility was not significantly correlated with the other four dimensions., and thus it was dropped from the analyses of Hypothesis One. (See Table 2 for results).

Credibility Hypothesis One posited that an additive model of ethnocentrism would account for more variance in credibility than would either prejudice or homophily alone. Table 3 indicated that the additive model was a significant predictor of source credibility. Table 4 indicated that homophily alone was a significant predictor of credibility. Table 5 showed prejudice alone was not a significant predictor of credibility.

A one-tailed t-test for differences indicated that the additive model was not significantly different from the homophily model (t=1, df=73, $p > .05$). Hypothesis One was not totally supported by this data.

Interpersonal Attraction Hypothesis Two predicted that the additive model would be a better predictor of interpersonal attraction than would prejudice or homophily alone. Table 6 indicated that the additive model was a significant predictor of attraction. Table 7 revealed that homophily alone was a significant

predictor of attraction. Table 8 indicated that prejudice alone did not predict attraction alone.

A test of the differences between the models revealed that the additive model of ethnocentrism was a better predictor of attraction than homophily alone. (t=4.5, df=73, $p<.05$). Although the actual r's obtained in the case of the ethnocentrism model can not be directly compared to the prejudice r, there is some indication that the additive model seems a better predictor than prejudice alone.

Comprehension Hypothesis Three stated that an additive model of ethnocentrism would be a better predictor of comprehension than would either prejudice or homophily alone. The overall multiple regression for the additive model was not significant (see Table 9).

Because the additive model was not significant, it was necessary to conclude that Hypothesis Three was not supported.

For information purposes, the regression analyses of prejudice and homophily were reported in Tables 10 and 11. Because these results were in a direction opposite of that predicted, two supplementary analyses were computed.

Supplementary Analyses An analysis of variance was computed using prejudice as the independent variable and comprehension as the dependent variable (see Table 11). This analysis indicated that the overall model was not significant. Since this was contrary to the regression analysis and because the data indicated a non-linear relationship may exist between the two variables, a Linear Trends Analysis (Ferguson, 1971) was computed. The F value for the linear model was 4.70 ($p<.05$), and the F for the non-linear model was 200.9 ($p<.001$). This revealed a significant non-linear relationship between prejudice and comprehension in this data.

DISCUSSION

Although there was a strong rationale for advancing a new model of ethnocentrism, the model proposed by this study received only limited support. The results gained from hypothesis One indicated that the subjects perceptions of homophily-heterophily can predict perceptions of source credibility at least as effeciently as the additive model of ethnocentrism. But it was also the case that prejudice towards outgroups adds little to the prediction of credibility. This does not support the findings of Aronson and Golden (1962), but it does support the more recent studies of Feldman (1972) and Feldman and Hilterman (1975). There seems to be a growing body of literature which indicates that stereotyping is subsumed under the more general process of trait attribution.

The results of the tests of Hypothesis Two supported the model proposed by these authors. Yet, there was only a three percent increase in the amount of variance accounted for. This figure is extremely low, and probably of limited value socially. The results obtained conform well to the Byrne model of interpersonal attraction. The addition of prejudice to the model did little to improve its predictive power.

The results of comprehension tests were most surprising. The interpretation of these results should proceed with caution, but there is some indication of why Miller (1975) and Irvine and Anderson (1975) failed to note any effects of prejudice on comprehension. First, the previous studies failed to control for attention effects and thus were biased by that factor. Second, this study seems to suggest that a non-linear relationship exists between prejudice and comprehension. These two factors provide a strong rationale for additional replications of the two previous studies.

Limitations and Future Considerations The moderate reliability for the prejudice scale limits the findings of this study. Although reliability for

the seven items was not low, it is likely that a more powerful instrument would yield better results.

Also a post hoc measure of readibility revealed that the experimental message was extremely difficult to read. This led to the scores on the cloze measure to be artificially depressed.

REFERENCES

Adorno, T. W., et. al. The authoritarian personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1950.

Allport, G. W. The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Andersen, P. A. & McNeill, L. B. Ethnic stereotypes: The credibility of names. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, December, 1972.

Anisfeld, M., Bogo, N. & Lambert, W. Evaluation reaction to accented English speech. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 223-231.

Aronson, E. & Golden, B. The effects of relevant and irrelevant aspects of communicator credibility on opinion change. Journal of Personality, 1962, 30, 135-146.

Bogardus, E. Racial distance changes in the U. S. during the past 30 years. Sociology and Social Research, 1958, 43, 127-134.

Brigham, J. C. Racial stereotypes, attitudes and evaluations of and behavioral intentions toward Negroes and Whites. Sociometry, 1971, 34, 360-380.

Burk, J. L. The effects of ethnocentrism upon intercultural communication: functional and disfunctional. Paper presented at the Convention of the Speech Communication Association, in Houston, December, 1975.

Byrne, D. & McGraw, C. Interpersonal attraction towards Negroes. Human Relations, 1964, 17, 201-213.

Byrne, D. & Wong, T. J. Racial prejudice, interpersonal attraction and assumed dissimilarity of attitudes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 246-253.

Chall, J. S. Readability: An appraisal of research and application. Columbus: Bureau of Educational Research Monographs, 1958, No. 34.

Clark, K. & Clark, M. Racial identification and preference in Negro children. In T. M. Newcomb & E. L. Hartley (Eds.) Readings in Social Psychology, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1947.

Delia, J. G. Dialects and the effects of stereotypes on inter-personal attraction and cognitive processes in impression formation. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1972, 58, 285-298.

Ehrlich, H. J. The Social Psychology of Prejudice. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1973.

Feldman, J. M. Stimulus characteristics and subject prejudice as determinants of stereotype attribution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1972, 21, 33-40.

Feldman, J. M. & Hilterman, R. J. Stereotype attribution revisited. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1975, 31, 1177-1188.

Ferguson, G. A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education. (3rd Ed.), New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1971.

Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Irvine, L. F. & Anderson, G. K. The effects of speaker's race upon person perception. Journal of Psychology, 1975, 90, 3-9.

Katz, D. & Braly, K. W. Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1933, 28, 280-290.

Lambert, W. E. & Klineberg, O. Childrens' views of foreign peoples: A cross-national study. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Levine, R. A. & Cambell, D. Ethnocentrism. New York: Wiley, 1972.

McCroskey, J. C., Jensen, T. & Valencia, C. The measurement of credibility of peers and spouses. Paper presented at the convention of the International Communication Association, Montreal, April, 1973.

McCroskey, J. C. & McCain, T. A. The measure of interpersonal attraction. Speech Monographs, 1974, 41, 261-266.

McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P. & Daly, J. A. The development of a measure of perceived homophily in interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 1975, 1, 323-332.

Miller, D. T. The effect of dialect and ethnicity on communicator effectiveness. Speech Monographs, 1975, 42, 68-74.

Newcomb, T. M. The acquaintance process. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1961.

Nunnally, J. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1967.

Phillips, E. L. Attitude towards self and others: A brief report. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1951, 15, 79-81.

Rabbie, J. M. & Horowitz, M. Arousal of ingroup-outgroup bias by chance win or lose. Journal of Personality and Social Psyhcology, 1969, 13, 269-277.

Rogers, E. & Shoemaker, F. Communication of innovations.Toronto: The Free Press, 1971

Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Rokeach, M. & Mezei, L. Race and shared belief as factors in social choice. Science, 1966, 151, 167-172.

Rokeach, M. & Rothman, G. The principle of belief congruence and the congruity principle as models of cognitive interaction. Psychological Review, 1965, 72, 128-142.

Rokeach, M., Smith, P. & Evan, R. I. Two kinds of prejudice or one?. In M. Rokeach, (Ed.). The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Seago, D. W. Stereotypes: Before Pearl Harbor and after. Journal of Psychology, 1947, 23, 55-63.

Secord, P. F. Stereotyping and favorableness in perception of Negro faces. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 309-315.

Sumner, W. G. Folkways. Boston: Ginn, 1906.

Taylor, D. M. & Gardner, R. C. Ethnic stereotypes: Their effects on the perception of communicators of varying credibility. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 1969, 23, 161-173.

Taylor, W. L. Applications of cloze and entropy measures to the study of contextual restraints in samples of continuous prose. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1954.

Triandis, H. C. A note on Rokeach's theory of prejudice. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1961, 62, 184-186.

Triandis, H. C. & Davis, E. E. Race and belief as determinants of behavioral intentions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 715-725.

Wheeless, L. R. Relationship of four elements to immediate recall and student-instructor interaction. Journal of Western Speech Communication Association. 1975, 39, 131-140.

Wilson, G. Tribalism in Kenya. In R. A. Levine & D. Cambell, (Eds.) Ethnocentrism. New York: Wiley, 1972.

Zadrozny, J. T. Dictionary of social science. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1959.

TABLE 1

Ethnocentricism: Unrotated Factor Matrix

Item	Factor Loading
1.	.29
2.	-.18
3.	-.30
4.	.36
5.	-.20
6.	.23
7.	-.19
8.	.68*
9.	-.29*
10.	.53*
11.	-.53*
12.	-.28
13.	-.01
14.	-.61*
15.	.10
16.	.04
17.	-.54*
18.	.02
19.	-.25
20.	-.55*

*Items chosen for analysis.

TABLE 2

Factor Correlation Matrix for Source Credibility

		A	B	C	D	E
Competence	A	1	-.01*	.04*	.33	.29
Character	B		1	.05*	.35	.34
Composure	C			1	.15	.05*
Extroversion	D				1	.30
Sociability	E					1

*$p > .05$ otherwise $p < .05$

TABLE 3

Canonical Correlation: The Additive Model
Predicting Source Credibility

Canonical Variable	Canonical Correlation	Chi-Square	df	$p = \chi^2$
1	.4508	21.4	12	< .05

Correlation coefficients between canonical variables

canonical variable	ethnocentricism	attitude homophily	background homophily
1	.13	.63	.99

canonical variable	competence	character	extroversion	sociability
1	.13	.82	.29	.82

TABLE 4

Canonical Correlation: Homophily
Predicting Source Credibility

Canonical Variable	Canonical Correlation	Chi-Square	df	$P = X^2$
1	.4504	21.5	8	<.05

correlation coefficients between canonical variables

canonical variable	attitude homophily	background homophily
1	.63	.99

canonical variable	competence	character	extroversion	sociability
1	.13	.82	.29	.82

TABLE 5

Simple Regressions: Ethnocentricism as the Predictor

Criterion	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	r^2
Competence	1	.003	.003	1	<.01
error	74	592.67	8.00		
Character	1	1.47	1.47	<1	<.01
error	74	866.47	11.71		
Extroversion	1	1.65	1.65	<1	<.01
error	74	885.77	11.97		
Sociability	1	2.26	2.26	<1	<.01
error	74	868.84	11.74		

TABLE 6

Canonical Correlation: The Additive Model Predicting Interpersonal Attraction

Canonical Variable	Canonical Correlation	Chi-Square	df	$P = \chi^2$
1	.46	20.9	6	<.05

Correlation coefficients between canonical variables

Canonical variable	ethnocentricism	attitude homophily	background homophily
1	-.30	.84	.84

canonical variable	social attraction	task attraction
1	.99	.25

TABLE 7

Canonical Correlation: Homophily
Predicting Interpersonal Attraction

Canonical Variable	Canonical Correlation	Chi-Square	df	$P = X^2$
1	.43	17.0	4	$< .05$

Correlation coefficients between canonical variables

canonical variable	attitude homophily	background homophily
1	.93	.88

canonical variable	social attraction	task attraction
1	.99	.12

TABLE 8

Simple Regressions: Ethnocentricism as Predictor

Criterion	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	r^2
Social Attraction	1	4.46	4.46	1.1	.02
error	74	290.22	3.92		
Task Attraction	1	7.44	7.44	1.8	.02
error	74	303.76	4.10		

TABLE 9

Multiple Regression for Comprehension:
The Additive Model

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	r^2
Regression	3	135.2	45.1	1.96**	.075
error	72	1658.8	23.0		
Total	75	1794.0			
(A) ethnocentricism	1	116.9	116.9	5.1*	
(B) attitude homophily	1	17.1	17.1	< 1	
(C) background homophily	1	20.0	20.0	< 1	

**p<.20
*p < .05
Standardized beta values: (A) = -.26; (B) = -.13; (C) = .14.
Intercept = 14.7

TABLE 10

Simple Regression for Comprehension:
Ethnocentricism Alone

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	r^2
Ethnocentricism	1	112.4	112.4	4.95*	.063
Error	74	1681.6	22.7		
Total	75	1794.0			

*$p < .05$
Standardized beta value = -.25
Intercept = 14.3

TABLE 11

Multiple Regression for Comprehension: Homophily

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	r^2
Regression	2	18.3	9.26	<1	.01
error	73	1775.7	24.3		
Total	75	1794.0			
(A) attitude homophily	1	16.5	16.5	<1	
(B) background homophily	1	13.1	13.1	<1	

Standard beta values: (A) = -.12; (B) = .11
Intercept = 8.68

TABLE 12

Analysis of Variance for Comprehension: Ethnocentricism

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Ethnocentricism	2	48.93	24.46	1.02
Error	73	1745.07	23.90	
Total	75	1794.00		

Table 13

Means for Comprehension: Ethnocentricism

N	Ethnocentricism	Mean
14	Low	9.64
49	Moderate	7.73
13	High	7.23